

## REMARKS

Re-examination and allowance of the above-captioned application is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully traverses the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection set forth by the Examiner. According to a feature of the instant invention, a receiver receives two types of data; namely facsimile data and e-mail data. Upon receipt of at least one of the two types of data, a communicator transmits a reception notification to the connected terminal(s). The reception notification is performed so that the two types of data are distinguishable from each other at the terminal(s). This feature is described with respect to, for example, Figs. 9 and 11 and pages 18, line 22 through page 20, line 23 of Applicant's application.

Applicant submits that at least this feature is not disclosed or suggested by the prior art combination (U.S. Patent 5,892,909 to GRASSO et al., in view of U.S. Patent 6,438,600 to GREENFIELD et al.) set forth by the Examiner. GRASSO discloses (see column 12, lines 45-67) that an Optus fax server accepts Postscript or PCL-formatted content. Column 15, lines 49-67 of GRASSO specifies that facsimiles are transferred by rendering the primary file in an interchange (e.g., Postscript) format, which is sent to a server to be further rendered to a set of common print formats. Accordingly, Applicant submits that facsimiles in GRASSO are not exchanged in a facsimile format, but are converted to another format. This differs from Applicant's invention, in which

facsimile data (and e-mail data) are transmitted in their original format.

Applicant further submits that GREENFIELD fails to disclose or suggest the above-discussed feature that is lacking in GRASSO. Accordingly, Applicant submits that even if one attempted to combine the teachings of GRASSO and GREENFIELD in the manner suggested by the Examiner, one would fail to arrive at the instant invention, in which facsimile data and e-mail data are receivable by a terminal, and upon receipt of at least one of the two types of data, a reception notification is transmitted so that the two types of data are distinguishable from each other at the terminal.

By the current amendment, Applicant amends independent claim 17 to more clearly specify that a receiver receives facsimile data and/or e-mail data which is detected by a detector, in which an applet is executed by the terminal when the reception of facsimile data and/or e-mail data is detected, the reception notification being transmitted so that the facsimile data and the e-mail data are distinguishable by the terminal. As at least this feature is submitted to be neither disclosed or suggested by the applied art of record, Applicant submits that independent claim 17, along with its dependent claims, are allowable, and respectfully request such an indication from the Examiner.

Applicant also submits new independent claim 43 for the Examiner, which is based upon independent claim 28, which has herewith been canceled. As a result,

claims that previously depended from claim 28 have been revised to now depend from claim 43. These claims are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons applicable to claim 17; namely, that upon receipt of facsimile data and/or e-mail data, a reception notification is transmitted to the terminal(s) that enables the two types of data to be distinguishable from each other at the terminal(s).

Pursuant to M.P.E.P. §714.13, Applicant contends that entry of the present amendment is appropriate because the proposed claims avoid the rejection set forth in the last Office Action, resulting in the application being placed in condition for allowance, or alternatively, the claims place the application in better condition for purposes of appeal. Applicant also notes that they have reduced the number of claims in the application to simplify the examination process. Accordingly, entry of the present amendment is respectfully requested.

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION


In view of the fact that none of the art of record, whether considered alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the present invention as now defined by the pending claims, and in further view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the Examiner's action and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested and are believed to be appropriate.

Should an extension of time be necessary to maintain the pendency of this application, including any extensions of time required to place the application in

condition for allowance by an Examiner's Amendment, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee to Deposit Account No. 19-0089.

If there should be any questions concerning this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,  
Yutaka IYOKI

  
\$7,314.38  
Bruce H. Bernstein  
Reg. No. 29,027

September 10, 2003  
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 Roland Clarke Place  
Reston, VA 20191  
(703) 716-1191